Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 16:01:47 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #669
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 15 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 669

Today's Topics:

"73's" (2 msgs)
(none)
1750-meter info?
AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences
Fun with a PK88
Ham Radio Costs at FCC
IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.
Nickel Hydride Cells
routing test
test
VPED???
WANTED: good 2meter mobile

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 15 Jun 94 13:38:55 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!lynx.unm.edu!pacs.sunbelt.net!
DDEPEW%CHM.TEC.SC.US@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CrG1G9.170@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:
>teacherjh@aol.com (Teacherjh) writes:
>
>>Language is dynamic, not static. 73's (the plural of 73, by many

>>official accounts) means "Best Wishes". It didn't used to, but it
>>does now.
>
>>Therefore, 73 means "best wish". So, if you say 73, you are only
>>wishing the listener one wish. OK, it's your best one, but it's
>>still only one. If you want to be more ebulliant, use 73's. (Or you
>>can try 146, 219, or any of the other muliples of 73 to give a fixed
>>number of wishes.)
>
>Didn't you see Aladdin? You can't wish for more wishes.
>
>Sheesh.
>
>3333333,
>Dave
>--
>Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

73 means "best regards." So, 73's must mean "best regardses." Is that
what we want to communicate? If so, then best regardses to you and farewells
until next time.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 19:02:54 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!cro@uunet.uu.net
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <MARK.94Jun15103016@bonnie.era.com>, mark@ERA.COM (Mark Feit) writes:
|> All of this kind of makes me wonder if saying "Seven Three" is
|> politically incorrect...
|>
|> SEVEN THREESES ES FEH!

Well it might be politically incorrect but it sure is correct. We don't
want to offend anyone now by trying to correct them. It's politically
correct to let people go on living in ignorance. That's smart.

Date: 15 Jun 94 20:52:21 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: (none)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

subscribe

Esteban J. Morao YV5DTA
z801183a@bcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 10:39:27 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!psgrain!
news.tek.com!gv-gate.gvg.tek.com!grovmac.gvg.tek.com!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 1750-meter info?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tki4b$sja@newshost.lanl.gov>, chris.pearcy@hyperion.lanl.gov
(Chris Pearcy) wrote:

> Does anyone have info on the "no-license-required" 1750-meter band
> (160-190 kHz) or the Panaxis CW transceiver kit for that band?
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Say - what is this transceiver? I'm interested.

--
Grover Cleveland Instructional Designer The Grass Valley Group Inc.
WT6P@KE6LW.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA (916) 478-3153

Date: 15 Jun 94 20:54:34 GMT
From: uswnvg!cjackso@uunet.uu.net
Subject: AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Ronald H. Bafetti (baffer@pnet01.cts.COM) wrote:
: Anyone out there using (or familiar with someone who uses) the AEA IsoLoop
: antenna? It's kind of caught my fancy as a reasonable alternative to a
: full-sized beam. Is it the urban dweller's answer to casual QSOs in the
: 10-30MHz world?

I've got one in my attic, and it works great as far as I can tell. I've only
worked 10M, and if I can hear 'em I can work 'em. I've also got a 10M
delta loop mounted outside, and unless the station I'm trying to work is
at EXACTLY the right angle to the delta loop, the IsoLoop actually
outperforms it by a couple of S units.

Tuning it can be a bit of a pain - but once you get used to it, it's not bad
at all. I'm looking forward to getting it mounted outside later this
year.

--
Clay Jackson - N7QNM
US WEST NewVector Group Inc
Bellevue, WA
uunet!uswnvg!cjackso

Date: 15 Jun 94 13:10:56 -0600
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!fnnews.fnal.gov!fndcd.fnal.gov!levy@ames.arpa
Subject: Fun with a PK88
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Here's a little story about a PK88. I bought it a few months ago. The manual stated (on page A-6, under the DAYtime command) that it was possible to install a Dallas SmartWatch, by removing the RAM chip at U5, inserting the SW, and plugging the RAM chip into the SW. No problem, I thought, and ordered the SW.

It shows up, and I go looking for U5. No U5, all the chips use the IC prefix. The schematic show the RAM chip as IC13. It's soldered in, and there's a heat sink right above it. So, I call AEA. They stopped socketing the RAM, but apparently forgot to remove that paragraph from the manual. The software support for the SW is still there, and I could install it if I really want to by desoldering the RAM, and taking a small hunk out of the heat sink to allow clearance. What the heck, it'll void my warranty, but I really want this thing to keep time accurately, and when it's off. So, I get the RAM chip out OK, solder in a socket, plug in the SW and the RAM, and everything's OK. Happy ending.

I'm just a little (really little) peeved at AEA for making it difficult to do something that should be easy, but for the cost of a socket, it's a pain. Also, if that paragraph hadn't been in the manual, I never would have started the whole thing to begin with. Other than that, it's been an pretty good unit. Lightning struck nearby a few weeks ago, and blew out the RS232 transmitter chip (75188), but fortunately, that *was* socketed...

--

[Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory]
[Mark E. Levy, N9RXF |]
[BitNet: LEVY@FNAL | Unix is to computing]
[Internet: LEVY@FNAL.GOV | as an Etch-a-Sketch is to art.]
[HEPnet/SPAN: FNAL::LEVY (VMS!) |]

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 16:34:38 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio Costs at FCC
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9406151054.AA04747@itchy.ncsl.nist.gov> rc@itchy.ncsl.NIst.GOV (Robert Carpenter) writes:
>Gary Coffman wrote:
>> We're *not* a big sink to the FCC. They spend on average 8 manhours a
>> week on the amateur service. It's the cheapest to administer service
>> that they regulate.
>
>Let's get a few things straight ! Entering the ham license info into
>the computer at Gettysburg may only require 8 staff hours a week (probably
>not a man). BUT......
> 1) Who buys the paper / pays the postage / etc. ? Who DONATED their
> new computer ? Is there a supervisor ?
> 2) Do the FCC/Washington people like W3BE and secretary and maybe
> an assistant DONATE their time? I thought they were paid. Someone
> has to handle the rulemaking petitions and other harassment from
> the hams at large. Or maybe you want this activity delegated to
> the ARRL...who would doubtless do it for free (NOT!) ;-)
> 3) Do the government people who go to the international allocations
> meetings and fend off a certain number of threats to the bands DONATE
> their time?
> 4) Etc.
>Thinking that amateur radio costs the taxpayer no more than the salary of
>one nice lady who types in the license info one day a week is like thinking
>that the only cost in a broadcasting station is the on-air people. You DO
>work for free, don't you Gary ?

Bob, of course the FCC has general operating overhead, just like any organization, but those costs are mostly *fixed* across all the radio spectrum that they regulate. We have staff engineers, lawyers, and accountants whose costs are fixed regardless of what programs we run. They wouldn't cost more or less if the "program" were amateur radio or commercial land mobile. In the case of the FCC operations you outline above, I consider those costs to be the costs of regulating *any* public spectrum and as such should be charged, as they are, to the public at large via the general fund. The spectrum wouldn't be vacant if we weren't there, another "program" would fill the void and require staff services just the same. It's the *public* interest the FCC services, not ours, and it's the public who should, and do, bear the costs.

The FCC has said repeatedly that the amateur service requires the *least* amount of their staff time of any of the services they actively regulate, such as mass media or telcos or land mobile. They really do dedicate only

8 manhours a week specifically to amateur radio within the Private Radio Bureau. And all the paper, and paperwork, is at *their demand*, though admittedly the Incentive Licensing mess is mostly at ARRL demand. Perhaps that *should* be charged to the ARRL.

Enforcement, what little there is, is spectrum wide, not specific to amateur radio. And international frequency conferences similarly address spectrum wide policy, not specifically amateur radio. The US has obligated itself to participate in these things by treaty *regardless* of the topic of negotiation. It's fixed overhead assignable to the general public interest in managing public spectrum. It's not an amateur radio specific expense.

Like with any other radio service, there are occasional dockets and filings dealing with amateur radio spectrum that they have to consider, but that takes no more staff or Commissioner time than it would if the spectrum were land mobile instead of amateur, in fact generally less since the Commission tends to rubber stamp ARRL proposals and reject others out of hand. The Commission has to deal with that spectrum *anyway* regardless of who occupies it, and deal with *citizen* filings regardless of whether they are licensees of a particular service or not, so no additional staff time is required over and above their statutory obligations to manage the public spectrum *in the public interest*.

Remember the FCC isn't doing anything *for* us, they're doing things *to* us that they consider in the *public* interest. It's *their* imposed requirements restricting *our* access to *our* public spectrum that generates their workload. We should actually demand that they pay *us* for the inconvienences they cause us.

Gary
--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 15 Jun 94 18:51:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>Immediate licensing was an EXCELLENT idea. I believe that nearly EVERY
>ham on the air would have agreed with this. The VE's giving the exam
>should have been allowed to call the FCC computer, use a modem, and
>enter the data directly into the FCC database, at which point a call-
>sign would have been spit out. Ideally, THIS is the way it should be.

not all exam sites have a phone line available. i know a fair number of VEs that think me nuts for returning long distance calls when people call me up about the monthly exams we hold. we don't have a phone line available so at best i'd have to go someplace where a phone line is available or pay air time for a cell radiophone line plus ld charges. yes, the school has phones, but no, we don't have them available to us and they probably wouldn't let us make toll calls anyway.

another VE group's contact gets hyper over such things (even when he's not paying the bill...) and we've had "discussions" over why i shouldn't spend my 50 cents to call back someone who's going to make a 100 mile trip only to find out it's the wrong day or they forgot something or didn't know how to find the spot where the exams are given. I make him look bad, don'tcha know. I haven't told him about the volumes of fliers and information sheets that are sent to the various places around the county and amateur speciality stores that i do at my expense using professional quality tools and fonts i've actually licensed for my use at home..8) (what can i say? it's a good feeling when you can get a flier to be to the point as well as attractive ..) i don't think he knows about our use of IR headphones either...(koss jck-200's and HB-500s...much better than the radio shack dreck but the RS phone probably would be OK at home).

a better way would be to drop a limited number of calls to each VE team as requested but this runs afoul of those who sell out the service with exam fraud.

this problem will have to be solved as a "pull"...got the laser printer for licenses - next we have the "improved" 610 and new computers to use it. get those working and then the next stage will be EDI from the VEC's and once that's working then we might be able to experiment with EDI from the VE team to the VEC...

bill wb9ivr

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 17:53:55
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!Germany.EU.net!netmbx.de!midas.cellware.de!
wsw.cellware.de!wsw@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Nickel Hydride Cells
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun13.083636.5538@ee.surrey.ac.uk> M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk (Mike Willis) writes:
>From: M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk (Mike Willis)
>Subject: Nickel Hydride Cells

>Date: Mon, 13 Jun 94 08:36:36 GMT

>I have just bought 6 Nickel Hydryde AA cells for use with my Icom handheld....
>
> ((deleted stuff))
>
>Any help is appreciated.

>Mike

Hi Mike,

I also thought about bying NiMHs for my HT (FT530), but then I heared, that they self discharge very quickly. So I looked for the best AA sized NiCd cells one can get and found Panasonicµs 900mAh cells. The cost is about 2/3 the NiMHµs and they work UFB! The only trick with them is that they donµt have the usual knob at the + pole, so I had to modify the contacts of the battery case.

73s de Stefan (DD6FM)

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 17:00:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: routing test
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <771658413.AA07906@urchin.fidonet.org>
Ron.Jurgs@f8325.n106.z1.fidonet.org writes:

>
> to: ju5752@tamug3.tamu.edu
> This is a routing test from the usenet
> users group
> ryryryryryryryr

Shouldn't that be RYRYRYRYRYRYRYR ?
Oh, wait a minute, that's for testing 5 bit data. Pick another character pair for testing 7 or 8 bit data.

73 es GM from Jeff

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com | a fanciful dimension to any

 US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 | story."
 Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080 | Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

Date: 15 Jun 1994 19:17:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!
tivoli.tivoli.com!wichita!kilgore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: test
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

test.

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 21:34:03 GMT
From: psinntp!relay1!ecdcsvr!klf@uunet.uu.net
Subject: VPED???
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

About a week ago or so I saw a posting for VPED. I believe this is a voice
version of PED. I can't seem to find the message. Can someone tell me the
archive site that was listed for this program. Thanks....

Ken KA3PLS
klf@ecdcsvr.tredydev.unisys.com

Date: 15 Jun 94 13:44:22 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!lynx.unm.edu!pacs.sunbelt.net!
DDEPEW%CHM.TEC.SC.US@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WANTED: good 2meter mobile
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tiu8h$acg@news.ysu.edu>, ap451@yfn.ysu.edu (Justin Randall Padawer)
writes:
>
>I'm looking for a 2 meter mobile unit in good shape for a reasonable
>price. Doesn't have to be the newest thing; please write with what you
>have. I just need something I can access a few local repeaters with.
>
>Thanks and 73,
>

>Randy
>
>--
>--
>Randy Padawer, P.O. Box 1167, Knoxville, TN 37901-1167 U.S.of A
>Internet: ap451@yfn.ysu.edu America Online: GwRepRandy
>Telephone: (615) 637-7263 Ham Radio op: WA4FJF & a groovy guy.

If anyone ELSE has an older 2M mobile unit or HT they want to get
rid of cheap (after Randy gets his) please let me know by Email. Tnx.

Dorr Depew

Date: 15 Jun 1994 13:08:36 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!apple.com!
apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tmvlr$9j@oak.oakland.edu>, <940615103721@emerald.nist.gov>,
<2tn7jq$bsf@tekadm1.cse.tek.com>
Subject : Re: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....

gaulandm@tekig7.pen.tek.com (Mike Gauland) writes:

>You answer your phone, "QRZ?"

Don't laugh, I know someone who did that with his telephone answering
machine.

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 20:32:27 GMT
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jun13141144@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<061494152337Rnf0.78@dreaml.wariat.org>,
<1994Jun15.101430.17147@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>.ch
Subject : Re: VHF Maritime Outrage!!

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>thing: IT'S ONLY IF YOU WANT A VANITY CALLSIGN!!! If you don't want to pay
>>$7/yr, FINE! Keep the callsign the FCC issued you and shut up. $7/yr to

>*Today* you don't have to pay it, but as witness the VHF Marine situation,
>this "reasonable" fee is only the foot in the door to higher taxes in
>the future. If people had known that the "reasonable" Federal Income

 I disagree. It hasn't been that long since there was a fee for
a ham license, with the fee varying by class. Renewals, address changes,
etc., were all subject to the fees. At worst, the FCC would simply be
reverting to a previous status, not creating some "new" fee. In any
case, I believe that Congress forced the issue of dropping the fees for
ham tickets; the same arguments against it still apply (go read some old
QSTs from the '60s and '70s for the full history).

 The "vanity" callsign charge is quite reasonable, considering that
states charge considerably more for vanity license plates.....plus
there is the issue of additional processing time over and above normal
processing of license applications, so if there is no fee the FCC will
raise their budget and you get to help pay for *everybody's* vanity
callsigns through your Federal tax dollars.....whether you have one
or not!

(|_|) * Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG * Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
 | |) * Senior Systems Engineer * Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062

 "You can have my bug when you can pry my cold, dead fingers from
 around it....." - anonymous radiotelegraph operator

Date: 15 Jun 94 20:06:25 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!
nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2ti78m$q4l@abyss.west.sun.com>, <2tihqv$e4q@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<1994Jun15.093131.16742@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of `440 in SoCal' thread)

In article <1994Jun15.093131.16742@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
>Handhelds, or mobile in motion? That's the purpose served by VHF/UHF
>repeaters, supporting handheld and mobile in motion stations.

Mobile in motion. Kent Britain, WA5VJB, has worked with systems up to at

least 10 GHz.

>Many fixed point to point links can be moved to microwave fairly
>easily, and should be to free up spectrum better suited for mobile in
>motion uses.

That's true too, although making a 95-mile path over flat terrain on 10 GHz
might get interesting...
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 19:44:42 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCrE1ED.1IE@netcom.com>, <2tketk$3os@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<rogjdCrFwnu.Bt2@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <rogjdCrFwnu.Bt2@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)
writes:
>Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:
>
>
>: I don't argue that. Everyone has the right to be wrong. :-)
>: When you start advocating that coordinators do patently stupid things that
>: will get them sued into oblivion, though, I have to stand up and yell, "HELL
>: NO!"
>
>Cites Jay. Cite the cases. I don't think you know jack about the law or
>suing, etc. Another silly argument that you have advanced repeatedly in
>this thread is essentially that anyone who changes coordination on an
>existing repeater is going to be sued and run into the ground financially.
>That's drivel. That's just not how the legal system works, and once
>again, if your tone weren't so arrogant your argument would be comic.

Roger, every day on the news and in the newspapers I hear/read of many
frivolous lawsuits being filed for what seems to me very silly reasons.
Yet no matter how ridiculous the claim the defendent must spend his/her
own hard earnied money defending him/herself. I think we all see how
high emotions are running in this debate and Jay is correct in that
some hams will certainly file a lawsuit if they can't get their way.
It's a shame when volunteers, believing they are doing their job properly,

have to fear lawsuits in carrying out their duties.

This topic is getting boring.

Jeff NH6IL
``Keep the soldering iron hot and the fingers cool.''

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #669
